

4 states require members of the state House of Representatives to be 25 years of age (Arizona, Colorado, South Dakota, Utah);

Utah specifies no age requirement for service in the state Senate;

21 states require members of the state Senate to be 25 years of age (Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming);

6 states require members of the state Senate to be 21 years of age (Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Oregon, Virginia);

6 states require members of the state Senate to be 30 years of age (Kentucky, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Tennessee, Vermont);

Delaware requires that a member of the state Senate be 27 years of age; and

Texas requires that a member of the state Senate be 26 years of age.

With respect to the age of majority listed for South Carolina (21), it should be noted that the proposed constitutional amendment approved by the South Carolina legislature lowering the age of majority in that state to 18 was voted upon favorably by the people of North Carolina in November 1974, the provision must still, however, be ratified by the state legislature.

NOTES

1. No specific age mentioned in State Constitution, and therefore the age of majority is assumed to also be the minimum eligibility age for election.

2. Age of majority is implied to be twenty-one by certain wording in the State Constitution, e.g., "of full age", "fit person", "reputable freeholder", or "freeholder." Twenty-one was always the age of majority in any of the early States Constitutions that specified an age.

3. Since the Governor was chosen by the Council from among its own members, the minimum age is assumed to be the same as for the Council.

4. This Maryland Constitution had the word "above" in front of each of the specified minimum ages. Therefore, it is possible that the ages should actually read 22, 26, and 26 respectively.

5. Since Council members were elected from among the members of the lower house, the minimum age is assumed to be the same as for the lower house.

6. The President could be elected from among the members of the Council (See Note 5) or from among the "people at large."

7. Age is not stated or implied.

POPULATION STATISTICAL ABSTRACT OF THE UNITED STATES, 1974-75

(National Data Book and Guide to Sources, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census)

Population by age and sex, 1970 and 1973:
1970: 18-20 years, 11.2 million; 21-24 years, 13.5 million; 25-34 years, 25.3 million.
1973: 18-20 years, 12.0 million; 21-24 years, 14.4 million; 25-34 years, 28.6 million.

Marital status of population by age and sex, 1973:

Males: 18-19 years, 349,000 or 9.5%; 20-24 years, 3,510,000 or 41.3%; 25-29 years, 5,639,000 or 75.4%.

Females: 18-19 years, 923,000 or 23.8%; 20-24 years, 5,366,000 or 58.9%; 25-29 years, 6,378,000 or 82.4%.

High School and College Graduates 1900-1974: 1974, approximately 1,011,000 graduated from college; 1940, approximately 187,000 graduated from college.

Labor Force: Percentage of Distribution by age and sex; 1950-73:

1973: Males, 20-24 years, 14.2%; 25-34 years, 23.8%.

1973: Females, 20-24 years, 16.2%; 25-34 years, 20.8%.

Percentage enrolled in school by level, sex and age, 1973:

College: Males, 18-24 years, 27.7%; 25-29 years, 11.6%.

Females, 18-24 years, 20.5%; 25-29 years, 5.2%.

From 1960 to 1970 shows a 107.6% increase in the number of students in college.

School enrollment and labor force status of persons 16-24 years, 1973:

	Percent
Armed Forces.....	3.8
In school.....	40.8
Labor force.....	18.1
In school.....	55.4
Labor force.....	42.6

APPENDIX C.—MINIMUM ELIGIBILITY AGES IN EARLY STATE CONSTITUTIONS

Note: All ages in parentheses are implied in the various State constitutions.

State	Age of majority	Lower house	Upper house	Governor
Connecticut: Constitution of 1818, (I could not locate an earlier Connecticut Constitution)...	21	(21)	¹ (21)	30 ²
Delaware: Constitution of 1776....	(21)	(21)	¹ 25	(25)
Constitution of 1792....	(21)	24	27	30
Constitution of 1831....	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Georgia: Constitution of 1777....	21	21	¹ (21)	(21)
Constitution of 1789....	21	21	21	30
Constitution of 1798....	21	21	25	30
Maryland: Constitution of 1776....	21	21	25	25
Constitution of 1851....	21	21	25	30
Massachusetts: Constitution of 1780.....	21	(21)	(21)	(21)
New Hampshire: Constitution of 1776....	(21)	(21)	¹ (21)	¹ (21)
Constitution of 1784....	(21)	(21)	30	30
Constitution of 1792....	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
New Jersey: Constitution of 1776....	² (21)	(21)	(21)	(21)
Constitution of 1844....	(21)	21	30	30
New York: Constitution of 1777....	(21)	(21)	(21)	(21)
Constitution of 1821....	(21)	(21)	(21)	30
North Carolina: Constitution of 1776....	(21)	(21)	(21)	30
Constitution of 1868....	(21)	(21)	25	30
Pennsylvania: Constitution of 1776....	21	(21)	¹ (21)	¹ (21)
Constitution of 1790....	21	21	25	30
Constitution of 1838....	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
South Carolina: Constitution of 1776....	(21)	21	¹ (21)	¹ (21)
Constitution of 1778....	21	21	30	30
Virginia: Constitution of 1776....	(21)	(21)	25	(?)
Constitution of 1830....	(21)	25	30	30
Rhode Island: (No delegate from Rhode Island signed the Constitution. Rhode Island apparently did not participate in the 1787 Constitutional Convention.) Constitution of 1842.....	21	(21)	(21)	(21)

¹ "Council."

² No change from previous Constitution.

³ "President."

Source: "The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, and other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Herebefore Forming the United States of America," Francis Newton Thorpe, editor, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1909, 7 vols.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON MARCH 5 BY GOVERNMENT INFORMATION AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE—SECRET SERVICE AND CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY EXEMPTIONS IN THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974—PUBLIC LAW 93-579

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, for the information of our colleagues I would like to announce forthcoming public hearings by the Government Information and Individual Rights Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee on

matters relating to the exemptions contained in subsections (j) (1) and (k) (3) of Public Law 93-579, the Privacy Act of 1974 enacted last year. These provisions apply to the Central Intelligence Agency and the U.S. Secret Service and exempt those agencies from access and disclosure requirements permitting individual Americans to examine their own records maintained by Federal agencies, the right to correct inaccuracies, and imposing restrictions on agencies' use or disclosure of personal information contained in such records without the consent of the individual. This landmark law becomes effective on September 27, 1975.

The initial hearings will be held on Wednesday, March 5, 1975, beginning at 10 a.m. in room 2203, Rayburn House Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, these hearings stem from assurances given the House last November 21 in a colloquy between the then chairman of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD), acting as floor manager of the privacy bill (H.R. 16373) and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN) (RECORD, p. H10961).

During the debate on my amendment to eliminate the so-called Secret Service exemption in the privacy bill, there was considerable discussion over the collection, maintenance, and use of a computerized protective intelligence list of individuals by the Secret Service under authority of section 3056 of title 18, United States Code. Our studies of such list indicated evidence of abuse in including the names and personal information on individuals because of their anti-war activities or other political beliefs, not because they posed any threat to the safety of the President or other governmental officials. In conceding the likelihood of such abuses, the then chairman of the subcommittee promised to hold hearings early in the new Congress to fully pursue the matter. The ranking minority member of the subcommittee concurred with this procedure and my amendment was subsequently defeated.

Although neither of these gentlemen is currently a member of the reorganized Government Information and Individual Rights Subcommittee, which I now chair in the 94th Congress, our subcommittee decided at our recent organizational meeting to schedule these hearings in order to fulfill the commitment made last November so that the need for amendments to the Privacy Act of 1974 could be put into proper focus.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment last November 21 to eliminate from the privacy bill the general exemption for the Central Intelligence Agency. (RECORD, p. H10955). At that time I argued that such exemption was too broad and that sensitive CIA records could be protected under the specific exemption provisions of subsection (k) of the bill. I further commented that "there is much information... that the CIA collects about individuals that is totally unrelated to the national security functions of the CIA." Since passage of the privacy bill, there has, of

lieved that our Government's representatives must age as well.

As of 1970, one-half of our entire population was under 25 years of age. Our Government cannot be called truly democratic when there exists such a large group of citizens who must carry the consequences of democratic decision-making, but who are not given a full and equal chance of participating in that very process.

An infusion of youthful citizens can offer positive effects for Congress. The new vitality, ideas, and idealism of youth would enliven a political system which often seems encrusted with worn-out traditions. Also, they would add a vital sense of equity to the legislative process. We ought to be trying to include, not keep out, people who are deeply affected by our Nation's problems. We need to make our Government truly a government of the people again, and this amendment is a step in that direction.

Current eligibility ages prevent our numerous younger citizens from fully feeling a part of the governmental system we all share. Giving youth a responsible role in our representative, political process may help to alter the sense of frustration and defeat that quite possibly may have contributed to the irresponsible behavior of some young Americans. Greater participation could provide them with a direct, constructive and democratic channel of access, and give them a truly responsible stake in America's future.

There is a definite moral aspect of this issue as well. This entire debate really revolves around a basic question of fairness. Pvt. Gerald Springer of the U.S. Army Reserve, in testimony supporting the 18-year-old vote, made some points quite relevant to the amendment proposed here:

If someone has an interest in our society, we give him a right to express his voice. What hope do we have for the future if we turn off the very people who are the future? We ask them to be responsible while we deny them responsibility. We ask them not to drop out, but we won't let them all the way in! Is this the American tradition?

The lowering of eligibility ages for service in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate is the next logical step after the overwhelming passage of the 26th amendment. America's youth have been doing their fair share. A 22-member task force, headed by Representative Brock of Tennessee, which studied the situation on American college campuses, strongly recommended lowering voting ages to permit, "active involvement in the political process which can constructively focus youthful idealism on the most effective means of change in a free society." To be truly valid, this active involvement in the political process must also include the right to run for Federal elective office.

Dr. Margaret Mead believes young people can "bring something to us in questioning the past and in establishing a partnership between young people and old people." Perhaps with such encouraged reflection and reevaluation, we can develop some positive future alterna-

tives. Dr. Roy Menninger, president of the Menninger Foundation, says that—

Giving 18 year-olds the vote is one step toward building more responsible citizens . . . but only one step. Others, not the least of which is giving youth the opportunity also to be a part of government at all levels . . . should be engaged. Not only can they profit from the participation as a means of learning, but they can also contribute a perspective, a vigor, an idealism which are all too often lacking.

The immense problems our country faces cannot possibly be solved by any one group. We can only hope for solutions when all groups are working together. We must meet the critical challenges of today by fully utilizing all of our great and vast resources. Isn't our youth power much too precious to waste?

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, lowering the eligibility ages for congressional service will simply, but importantly, create the possibility for younger men and women to be elected Representatives and Senators. Congress will not be inundated with immature members of untried ability and untested skill. Lowering the eligibility ages is not in any way a lowering of congressional standards. The same measure of competence, integrity, and general fitness for office will prevail and continue to apply equally to all congressional office seekers. The voters will still choose whom they think will best serve their and the Nation's interests. If, in their wisdoms, the voters decide that a citizen of 22—or 27—is the best candidate, they will have exercised their franchise as legitimately and freely as if they had chosen someone older.

Lowering the minimum age requirements by three years will eliminate unreasonable and anachronistic age levels founded in 18th century traditions and prejudices that increasingly conflict with 20th century realities. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the earlier maturity, educational attainments, and extensive political involvement of our younger citizens are compelling arguments in favor of lowering the congressional eligibility ages. In the face of such overwhelming statistical evidence, our society must assume the burden of proof to show why our young men and women should continue to be excluded from election to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment's major benefits are threefold:

First. The Nation: Madison pointed out in the *Federalist* that—

The electors (under the new U.S. Constitution) are free to choose those whom they deem most fit to represent them.

The proposed amendment is an important expansion of that basic freedom. If the amendment is adopted millions of young Americans would become eligible to serve as Representatives and Senators. A Nation founded on democratic principles can only be strengthened when more of its citizens are eligible for full participation in its government.

Second. The Congress: Congress potential to be truly representative of all of the people will be markedly and dramatically increased by the "22-27

amendment." An adequately diverse Congress must display a wide rather than narrow distribution of ages among its Members. Citizens under 30 are indisputably underrepresented in Congress. The proposed amendment will create the genuine possibility for such a disparity to be rectified. In addition, I am convinced that younger citizens in Congress would bring new vitality, ideas, and idealism into the national legislative process.

Third. Younger citizens: One of the chief causes of youthful alienation—a feeling of being locked out of the system—would be significantly diminished if the possibility existed for more meaningful participation in government at an earlier age. The "22-27 amendment" would have the dynamic effect of promoting a deeper sense of responsibility among our younger citizens. By recognizing their maturity to participate, we also will give them the disquieting responsibility to participate maturely.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves if there exists any truly valid reason why younger people should not be allowed to fully participate in government. The very essence of democracy demands that its basis be as broad as can be reasonably and logically expected. The nonproperty holders of Richmond in a historic petition to the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829 wrote:

They alone deserve to be called free who participate in the formation of their political institutions.

The real issue in a free society is not why should they participate, but why should they not participate? As Mr. Theodore E. Sorensen, former counsel to President Kennedy and a noted legal authority, so succinctly said in regard to lowering the voting age—and this philosophy can apply equally well to lowering eligibility ages for Congress:

We should do it because there is no longer any legitimate reason not to do it . . . because arbitrary and unfair distinctions are repugnant to a democracy, and above all, because it is right.

I include the following supporting material:

A SUMMARY OF THE CURRENT AGE REQUIREMENTS SET BY THE SEVERAL STATES FOR SERVICE IN THEIR STATE LEGISLATIVE BODIES

18 States specify no age requirement for service in either House of the state legislature (California, Idaho, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Washington, Wisconsin);

5 states specify no age requirement for service in the state House of Representatives (Louisiana, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Vermont, West Virginia);

Hawaii requires that a member of either House in the state legislature be of the "age of majority" (Hawaii Constitution, Article III, Section 7);

24 states require members of the state House of Representatives to be 21 years of age (Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Wyoming);

3 states require members of the state House of Representatives to be 24 years of age (Delaware, Kentucky, Missouri);

course, been the public disclosures of CIA's "domestic operations" allegedly involving some 10,000 Americans. Several different executive and congressional investigations have been authorized to probe various intelligence gathering operations, including the CIA. However, our subcommittee's hearings will concentrate on the Privacy Act implications of such CIA domestic intelligence operations as they affect the privacy rights of Americans and how they impact upon the general exemption provided the CIA in subsection (j) (1) of the act.

Similar revelations have surfaced concerning the Internal Revenue Service's Special Services Staff, which targeted thousands of organizations and countless individuals between 1969 and 1973 that were considered by the White House to be a "political activist" or "leftist" nature. We understand that Commissioner Alexander has since disbanded the political intelligence gathering operations of IRS. The subcommittee is anxious to further explore the limited amount of information now available on the IRS operation to ascertain whether or not additional amendments may be necessary to the Privacy Act of 1974 to protect the American public against such types of abuses in the future.

The leadoff witness on March 5, 1975, will be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury David R. Macdonald, who will discuss the Privacy Act's exemption of the Secret Service Protective Intelligence record system and other similar systems of personal information collected and maintained pursuant to section 3056 of title 18, United States Code.

Also testifying that day will be CIA Director William E. Colby, who will discuss the exemption of the agency's personal records system, its domestic intelligence activities, and related matters.

Mr. Donald C. Alexander, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, will also testify concerning the activities of the IRS Special Services Staff, as well as other intelligence gathering and research activities affecting individuals that is or has been carried on by IRS. The relationship of such activities to provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974 relating to investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes will also be addressed by Mr. Alexander. The date of Commissioner Alexander's appearance will be announced.

Mr. Speaker, we trust that these investigative hearings by our subcommittee will be of interest to our colleagues of the Congress and to all Americans whose right to privacy is involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MONTGOMERY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCEDURES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today on behalf of the Committee on the Budget a report on implementation of the new congressional budget process in 1975.

As Members know, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974—Public Law 93-344—established a new congressional budget process beginning in 1976 with respect to the fiscal year 1977 budget. However, section 906 of the act provided for implementation of the new process earlier—that is, with respect to fiscal year 1976—if the Senate and House Budget Committees agreed to do so and to the extent required by them in reports to their respective Houses.

This report is filed pursuant to section 906. A similar report is being filed today in the Senate setting out identical procedures. The provisions of the act being implemented are effective immediately.

In brief, the implementation plan agreed to by the two Budget Committees calls for the adoption by the Congress of two concurrent resolutions on the budget: The first, to be adopted by May 15; the second, by September 15; and completion of a reconciliation process, if practicable. In addition, new backdoor contract and loan authorities would be effective only to the extent provided for in appropriations acts.

A more detailed summary of the implementation plan is set forth at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to study very carefully the report being filed today. This first effort to implement the new congressional budget process is a most important one. The budget and economic issues to be dealt with—the size of the Federal budget, the amount of the deficit, and so on—are overriding issues this year. The new budget process cannot succeed without the full cooperation of all House Members. The summary follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1976 BUDGET PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

During 1975 the House and Senate Budget Committees would implement the new budget process in the following manner:

- (1) Both Committees would hold hearings on the FY 1976 budget and the economic situation.
- (2) All standing committees and joint committees would submit their views and recommendations on budget matters within their jurisdiction to the Budget Committees by March 15.
- (3) Both Committees would report and complete action on a first concurrent resolution on the budget by May 15. This resolution would include the following five items:
 - (a) recommended level of total budget authority for FY 1976,
 - (b) recommended level of total outlays for FY 1976,
 - (c) recommended level of total revenues for FY 1976,
 - (d) recommended amount of deficit for FY 1976, and
 - (e) recommended changes, if any, in the public debt.

The figures contained in this first budget resolution are "targets" only, which serve to guide Congress' spending actions for FY 1976. The report accompanying this first res-

olution would, to the extent practicable, allocate the budget authority and outlay targets by functional categories, so that House committees could have relatively specific guidelines to work with.

(4) Both committees would, if practicable, report and complete action on a second concurrent resolution on the budget by September 15. This resolution would take into account Congress' summer spending actions and then current economic needs.

The figures adopted in this second resolution are "ceilings" in the following sense: once adopted, neither House may consider revenue or spending legislation that would breach the ceilings in the second resolution. Of course, a revised resolution may be adopted at any time during the fiscal year to accommodate new spending or revenue measures.

The second resolution may require certain reconciliation actions to be undertaken. If, for example, Congress's total spending actions exceed the amounts provided for in the second resolution, the House may direct committees with budget authority jurisdiction to rescind a portion of the budget authority made available in a particular spending bill. Similarly, if estimated revenues are below the amount called for in the resolution, the House may direct the Ways and Means Committee to increase revenues by the necessary amount. Such reconciliation actions must be completed by September 25.

(5) Effective immediately upon submission of the implementation plan to the House and Senate, new contract and borrowing authority would be effective only to the extent approved in appropriations acts; and new entitlement authority may not take effect until July 1, the beginning of the fiscal year.

SO-CALLED DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE TO ADMINISTRATION'S ENERGY PROGRAM RAISES MORE QUESTIONS THAN IT ANSWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we now have a so-called Democratic alternative to the administration's energy program in the form of a policy statement that raises more questions than it answers.

In the first place, I understand Mr. ULLMAN, who was not included when the Democratic leadership unveiled their proposal, will be holding hearings soon on his own energy tax program. It appears to be substantially different and I am wondering how the two proposals fit together?

Second. There appears to be no way that the Democratic leadership proposals will save more than 1 million barrels per day by 1977. This means we will be importing up to 2 million barrels more per day from insecure sources. Isn't this dangerous?

Third. The Democratic proposal suggests a gas tax of 5 cents per gallon, which will go into a trust fund. Since it will take some time for this money to get back into the economy, isn't it dangerous to take \$5 billion out of the economy right now?

Fourth. The Democratic proposal also calls for more conversion of powerplants from oil to coal, but fails to mention any amendments to the Clean Air Act. How can one be done without the other?

Fifth. The Democratic leadership proposal would require a 50-percent improvement in automobile fuel efficiency

by 1980 and 100 percent by 1985, but no extension of current emission standards is mentioned. Is this technologically possible? What would be the estimate of increased costs to the consumer of these standards?

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the questions I consider important and tomorrow I will have several other questions to pose.

TRIBUTE TO LATE NICHOLAS FERRANTE

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the year of 1971 took from our midst one of the great leaders within the American labor movement, Nicholas Ferrante, a resident of my home city, Syracuse, N.Y. His 50 years of service to the labor movement earned for him recognition as one of the best informed labor relations representatives in our Nation. He served as assistant industrial commissioner for the State of New York and for many years served as executive secretary of the Greater Syracuse Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

As I think of him frequently, I am reminded of the vacuum his passing provides, in recognition of his constant availability for counsel on labor-related matters. Recently, the Catholic Sun, the Syracuse diocesan newspaper, printed an article authored by another great in the field of industrial relations, Rev. Richard M. McKeon, S.J., of the faculty of LeMoyne College. I commend its reading to anyone who is interested in industrial and labor relations:

NICHOLAS FERRANTE

(By Rev. Richard M. McKeon, S.J.)

Last December, Onondaga Community College dedicated a magnificent building to the memory of a great labor leader, Nicholas Ferrante. It was a singular tribute to a man who was devoted not only to advancing industrial peace but also to the promotion of the common good within the community. The eulogy of Mr. Ferrante given by David M. Mawhinney Jr. touched both the minds and the hearts of the large audience. I doubt if any other labor leader has had a college building costing over \$8 million dedicated to him.

Nicholas Ferrante, one of the original members of Onondaga Community College's board of trustees, was active in the labor movement for nearly 50 years before his death in 1971. He served as executive secretary of the Greater Syracuse Labor Council, AFL-CIO, from 1960 until the time of his death and was considered by the State Labor Department as one of the "best informed men on labor relations in Syracuse."

Mr. Ferrante began his career as a bricklayer in 1933 and his first union office was as business agent for Local 28, Bricklayers Union. He was elected secretary for the former Syracuse Federation of Labor, AFL, in 1945, and held that post until 1955 when he was named by Governor Harriman to be assistant industrial commissioner in charge of the Syracuse district office of the State Labor Department. He served subsequently as supervisor of apprentice training until he became executive secretary in 1960.

He lent his labor relations expertise to the community in many ways, serving as president of the Le Moyne College Industrial Re-

lations Council and as a member of the Labor management Committee of the Syracuse Community Chest, the dedication program reports. During World War II, Mr. Ferrante was a panel member of the War Labor Board and a member of the OPA Labor Advisory Committee of Syracuse.

Mr. Ferrante was a member of the Urban League, a director of both the Syracuse Boys Club and Blue Cross-Blue Shield Corp., the Citizens Housing Committee, the Syracuse Housing Development Corporation, the Onondaga Charter Commission and the Educational Television Council of Central New York.

"Because of his interest in both Onondaga Community College and Le Moyne College, the Syracuse Basic Building Trades Council has established a scholarship to either school. Nicholas Ferrante Hall will serve as a lasting monument to the man who made a great contribution to his community and to his profession as well as to this college," the program said.

As a labor leader, Mr. Ferrante accepted the high duty to promote industrial peace while at the same time protecting the rights and improving the conditions of the workingman. Such a task is really without limit for "it is one which challenges all that is noble in the human heart."

Mr. Ferrante possessed the qualities which signify the mature labor leader. There never was question about his integrity and he knew his associates as human beings and not as statistics. By hard effort and experience he had become proficient in the field of collective bargaining.

Nick had patience—the exercise of sustained endurance and perseverance—to a high degree. He overlooked the faults of others. He took unpleasant situations as a challenge. At times he expected misunderstandings, suspicion and outright opposition. On the other hand, he hated double-dealing, subterfuge and all falsehood great and small. He had an intuitive sense of recognizing the phony and acted accordingly.

As noted, he gave long years of service to the labor movement and to the community of Onondaga County. Due to his efforts there has been a fine record of cooperation between labor and management. His constructive leadership should not be forgotten. To him we apply the biblical tribute: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

DEEP CONCERN OVER THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that all of us are deeply concerned about the American economy. This, of course, is evidenced in our everyday activity here in the Congress as we search for means which, hopefully, will alleviate the problem. As I travel my congressional district, this subject is, of course, No. 1 on the minds of all the people.

I am deeply heartened by a very generous effort which was undertaken by one of my area radio stations, Station WHEN, in Syracuse, N.Y. This station instituted a program whereas it would grant a \$50 bonus to any employee who purchased a new car during the month of February. The employee simply had to present his receipt and pick up the \$50 check.

We will all agree that this was indeed a positive act on the part of this Radio Station, which, incidentally, provides an

excellent public service in our community.

I feel certain that my colleagues would be interested in knowing of this generous initiative.

CANCER PREVENTION

(Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. One area in which that adage certainly appears applicable today is in the battle against cancer.

Consider in this light the thoughtful and timely article written by Peter Bernstein of the Newhouse News Service which appeared in the February 16, 1975, issue of the Washington Post. Mr. Bernstein points out that recent findings in cancer research indicate that from 60 to 90 percent of all human cancers are caused by environmental factors.

This is not a statistic to be taken lightly—not in these days of air and water pollution, of on-the-job exposure of carcinogens, of chemical additives in foods, and of pesticide residues in the food chain. It is a statistic which should cause alarm and spur this Congress and this administration into action to prevent cancer. One obvious method of prevention is to curtail job-related exposures to toxic chemicals and industrial byproducts which are known causes of malignancies.

I have long advocated enforcement of standards to protect the health of workers who daily place their lives in jeopardy because of exposure to dangerous substances. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 is aimed at protecting this Nation's work force, and enforcement of its provisions and establishments of appropriate safety standards and exposure levels are major methods of eliminating on-the-job exposure to daily carcinogens.

The Subcommittee on Manpower, Compensation and Health and Safety which I chair last year held 16 days of oversight hearings to monitor the administration of OSHA, and we will continue these hearings during the 94th Congress.

I commend Mr. Bernstein's article to my colleagues. It is a clear and cogent call for continued congressional oversight in the area of workers' health and safety. The article follows:

CANCER POLLUTION LINK IS SEEN

(By Peter J. Bernstein)

Painstaking detective work by medical researchers is producing mounting evidence that environmental impurities in man's habitat are the primary cause of most cancer.

Based on recent findings at a number of laboratories across the country, researchers at the National Cancer Institute estimate that 60 to 90 per cent of all human cancers are caused by environmental factors—from ultraviolet rays to plastics and pesticides.

The results show that while researchers have made some progress in developing a cure for certain forms of cancer, the most promising advances have been in prevention and early detection.